HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

February 27, 2003

Dago Mary's Restaurant
Hunters Point Shipyard, Building 916
Donahue Street at Hudson Avenue
San Francisco, California

Reported by Christine M. Niccoli, RPR, C.S.R. No. 4569

NICCOLI REPORTING
619 Pilgrim Drive
Foster City, CA 94404-1707
(650) 573-9339
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS SERVING THE BAY AREA

P A R T I C I P A N T S

FACILITATOR: MARSHA PENDERGRASS - Pendergrass & Associates

CO-CHAIRS: KEITH FORMAN - United States Navy SWDIV

LYNNE BROWN - Communities for a Better Environment, Community First Coalition

RAB MEMBERS

LANI ASHER - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), Community First Coalition (CFC)

AMY BROWNELL - San Francisco Department of Public Health

BARBARA BUSHNELL - ROSES, resident

MAURICE CAMPBELL - Business Development, Inc. (BDI); Community First Coalition (CFC); New California Media; NEW BAYVIEW NEWSPAPER

CHARLES L. DACUS, SR. - Hunters Point resident, ROSES

MARIE J. FRANKLIN - Shoreview Environmental, Incorporated

MARIE HARRISON - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW

MITSUYO HASEGAWA - JRM Associates

HELEN JACKSON - All Hallows Gardens Residents Association

KEVYN D. LUTTON - Resident

J. R. MANUEL - JRM Associates, India Basin resident

RAB MEMBERS [Cont.]:

JESSE MASON - Bayview-Hunters Point Community Advocates, Community First Coalition (CFC)
JULIE MENACK - Regional Water Quality Control Board
JAMES MORRISON - Environmental Technology
GEORGIA OLIVA - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), CCA member
SULULAGI PALEGA - Hunters Point Boys & Girls Club, Housing Authority, Samoan Community Development Center
DOROTHY PETERSON - Shoreview Resident Association
KAREN G. PIERCE - Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic Club
MELITA RINES - India Basin Neighborhood Association
AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI - Bayview-Hunters Point Health & Environmental Resource Center (HERC)
KEITH TISDELL - Hunters Point resident
RAYMOND TOMPKINS - Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition on Environment
CAROLINE WASHINGTON - Southeast Community College Advisory Board, Network for Elders
MICHAEL WORK - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
LEILANI WRIGHT - JRM Associates

---oOo---

OTHER ATTENDEES

KENNETH S. BAUGH - New World Environmental Inc.

DOUG BIELSKIS - Tetra Tech EM Inc.

ANDREW L. BOZEMAN - Southeast Sector Community Development Corp., Heaven's Glade

PATRICK BROOKS - United States Navy

ALITA BROWN - Shipyard artist

MIKE BURKARD - Denbeste Transportation Inc.

A. DON CAPOBRES - San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

FRANCISCO DA COSTA - Environmental Justice Advocacy

LIZ WHITTED DAWSON - Pendergrass & Associates

DARYL DeLONG - New World Environmental Inc.

DAVID B. DeMARS - United States Navy

LEM DOZIER

JAMES F. FIELDS - San Francisco Human Rights Commission

CDR. LINO FRAGOSO - United States Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO)

BOB HOCKER - Lennar/Bayview-Hunters Point Team

CAROLYN HUNTER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.

JONI JORGENSEN-RISK - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc., (I.T.S.I.)

PAULA KANESHIRO - KRT Services

RONALD W. KEICHLINE - Bechtel National, Inc.

MASON KIRBY - Quezada Architecture, resident

OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

LEA LOIZOS - Arc Ecology
JEFFREY LONG - Shipyard tenant
MARTIN OFFENHAUER - United States Navy
JOHN PELOSI - United States Navy (NAVSEA)
JOHN POLYAK - New World Environmental Inc.
DEBORAH BERMAN SANTANA - Mills College Ethnic Studies Department
LEE H. SAUNDERS - United States Navy
MATTHEW L. SHAPS, ESQ. - Paul Hastings LLP for Lennar
DAVID TERZIAN - The Point
PETER WILSEY - San Francisco Department of Public Health
STEFANIE YOW - Office of Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

---oOo---

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2003

6:05 P.M.

---oOo---

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. The February 27th, 2003, San Francisco Hunters Point Shipyard Restoration Advisory Board board meeting is now come to order.

Please find seats, board members around the table; environmental regulators, so forth, around the table.

And thanks to Melita, we have a new setup tonight.

MS. RINES: And if you don't like it, don't complain.

MS. BUSHNELL: That's the process.

MS. ATTENDEE: I like that.

MR. TISDELL: I don't like it.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Let's -- As we always do, let's start with introductions. And I'm Marsha Pendergrass, your facilitator tonight. We also -- I have a person working with me tonight named Liz Witted Dawson.

And we'll start over there with introductions. And if you could just say your name as -- loudly, stand up and say your name would be great so we can capture for the record.

Liz, you want to start?

MS. WHITTED DAWSON: Liz Whitted Dawson.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Dr. Sumchai?

MS. SUMCHAI: Ahimsa Sumchai.

MS. BROWNELL: Amy Brownell, San Francisco Health Department.

MS. OLIVA: Georgia Oliva, Shipyard artist, member of CBE and RAB board. Lani will be late.

MS. RINES: Melita Rines, India Basin Neighborhood Association.

MS. BUSHNELL: Barbara Bushnell, RAB, ROSES.

MR. DACUS: Charles L. Dacus, Sr., RAB and ROSES.

MS. PETERSON: Dorothy Peterson, community and RAB.

MR. MASON: Jesse Mason, Bayview Advocates, Community First Coalition, resident.

MS. WRIGHT: Leinani Wright, RAB member.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Before we go any further, want to start over here? Sir? Name, please.

MR. BAUGH: Kenneth Baugh, New World Environmental.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Please -- Kenneth Paul, New World Envir- --

MR. BAUGH: Baugh.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Paul.

MR. BAUGH: Baugh.

MS. ATTENDEE: P-a-u-l.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. DeLONG: Daryl DeLong, New World Environmental.

MR. BURKARD: Mike Burkard, Denbeste Transportation.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

MR. BURKARD: Denbeste Transportation.

THE REPORTER: No. Start from the beginning.

MR. BURKARD: Mike Burkard, Denbeste Transportation.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir, on the end there?

MR. POLYAK: John Polyak, P-o-l-y-a-k, New World.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Forman?

MR. FORMAN: Keith Forman, Navy RAB Co-chair and BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

MR. DeMARS: Dave DeMars, Navy Lead Project Manager.

MR. BROOKS: Patrick Brooks, Remedial Project Manager for the Navy.

MR. OFFENHAUER: Marty Offenhauer, Navy

Remedial Project Manager.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you get that, Christine?

State it one more time.

MR. OFFENHAUER: Marty Offenhauer.

MR. BROWN: Lynne Brown, Co-chair of RAB.

MR. WORK: Michael Work, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

MS. MENACK: Julie Menack, Regional Water Quality Control Board of the state of California.

MS. BROWNELL: I've already gone.

MR. TISDELL: Keith Tisdell.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Come on, Keith. Mr. Tisdell?

MR. TISDELL: Keith Tisdell.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Oh, yes, sir.

MS. LUTTON: Kevyn Lutton.

MS. JACKSON: Helen Jackson from All Hallows.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maurice Campbell, New California Media, BDI.

MR. TOMPKINS: Raymond Tompkins, RAB member.

MS. JORGENSEN-RISK: Joni Jorgensen-Risk, I.T.S.I.

MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald Keichline, Bechtel, community relations.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Let's start over here.

MR. DA COSTA: Francisco Da Costa,

Environmental Justice Advocacy.

MS. LOIZOS: Lea Loizos, Arc Ecology.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you get that?

THE REPORTER: (Nods.)

MR. WILSEY: Peter Wilsey, Department of Public Health.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Peter Wilson?

MR. WILSEY: Wilsey.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Wilsey. Department of Public Health.

MR. DOZIER: Lem Dozier . . . [unintelligible].

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Would you say it over, the last --

MR. DOZIER: Oh. Lem Dozier, D-o-z-i-e-r.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Lim, L-i-m?

MR. DOZIER: L-e-m.

MS. PENDERGRASS: L-e-m, okay.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. BROWN: Alita Brown, artist.

MR. SHAPS: Matt Shaps, environmental attorney for Lennar.

MR. HOCKER: Bob Hocker, Lennar-BVHP Team.

MR. FIELDS: James F. Fields, Human Rights

Commission.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Fields, welcome.

Yes, sir.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Lino Fragoso, RASO.

MR. BOZEMAN: Andrew Bozeman, Southeast Sector Community Development Corp.

MS. HUNTER: Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

MR. BIELSKIS: Doug Bielskis, Tetra Tech.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Anybody we forget? Anybody over on this side that we overlooked?

I'm sorry, sir, did we get -- did you get introduced?

MR. LONG: Jeffrey Long, Shipyard tenant.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Sir, in the back in the red jacket.

MR. BURKARD: I've already -- Mike Burkard.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

As you see, I have a hoarse voice tonight, so I'm really struggling tonight.

All right. Has everybody had a chance to review the agenda?

Did everybody remember to sign in on the -- the sheet as you came in? Please. And the reason why we

need to capture your names clearly is because this is public record. This is a public meeting.

All right. We have had a chance to review the agenda. Any changes or suggestions?

All right. We'll move right along, then.

Has everybody had a chance to review the minutes?

MS. BUSHNELL: Yeah.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Does anybody have anything they'd like to tell me about the minutes?

MS. BUSHNELL: Yes. I -- There's a item on page 4. It's part of the City's health report. It's in the second paragraph. It's about one, two, three, four, five lines down. It starts -- The statement says, "She stated that this analysis is not perfect because [sic] it does not include people who may not have experienced symptoms but did not seek treatment . . . ."

I think there -- the "not" -- the second "not" should not be there, because it says in -- says in further on down, she reiterated that fire -- "people who . . . suffered fire related symptoms but did not seek hospital treatment." I think it's just a triple negative.

MS. RINES: Too many nots.

MR. KEICHLINE: Noted.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Yes, sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: On page 3 on -- and we're -- on Mr. Nelson's ATSDR presentation, we asked him if he knew exactly what was in the landfill. He replied he did.

This is contrary to other agencies not knowing what's there; and since their agency is responsible for toxics, we think that needs to be in the minutes, because it's highly inaccurate.

MS. PENDERGRASS: That he said he does not know or that he does know?

MR. BROWN: He does know.

MR. CAMPBELL: He does know, yeah.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. CAMPBELL: So that's -- that's a very serious statement.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Does everybody else remember that the same way? If not, we can look it up on the transcript and make sure it was --

MS. LUTTON: I remember that.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

Can you make a change, Ron?

MR. KEICHLINE: Yeah.

MR. WORK: Is the question do the minutes reflect what he said accurately? Because he works in my building, and I can have him take a look at it.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, it's kind of what happened at the meeting. Since we do have a verbatim transcript, we can always just double-check it.

MR. WORK: Okay. All right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Anything --?

MR. FORMAN: Yeah. Could we just do an action item for Ron Keichline, to double-check that --

MR. KEICHLINE: I'm double-checking --?

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- to see what he said about yes, he knew what was in the landfill.

MR. KEICHLINE: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I didn't miss some of the discussion.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Double-check that and correct it.

MR. FORMAN: Yeah. So that Maurice's concern is properly reflected, let's just go back to the literal transcript.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Right.

MR. ATTENDEE: Right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I need a motion.

MR. TOMPKINS: Hold on. I have one other point of correction.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

Also and then page 2 and 3 in terms of

discussions that I had with representative from ATSDR, he referred to in his discussion when I asked about the clarity that he had actual reports.

And I asked was there a difference from what we presented from the Navy dealing with the 22 days after the fire.

And I don't see any reflection where he was supposed to get back to us with that data in terms of those reports. If he has something that we don't have --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Well, I think that there are two parts --

MR. TOMPKINS: I made that real specific question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- two parts to that. We're in the minute reviews. Oh. If that's not reflected in the minutes, again, we need to go back and review the transcript to make sure that there was something that he --

MR. TOMPKINS: That's when we invited him to deal with the subcommittee on health and risk assessment.

MS. PENDERGRASS: But make sure you hold that point that we might need to add that as an action item.

MR. KEICHLINE: I was going to ask, is that an

action item or a minutes correction?

MR. TOMPKINS: Minutes correction.

MS. PENDERGRASS: It's a minutes correction.

MR. TOMPKINS: It was just -- I was given a practice point in time for minutes. But after I asked that, then that was a lead in to attend the meeting, but that we wanted the actual data that he said he had.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you get that?

MR. KEICHLINE: How do you want the minutes corrected to reflect that?

MR. TOMPKINS: We're asking for the actual test data that was taken at the time of the fire. He stated he had that.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. We'll look into that and make that correction.

MR. TOMPKINS: -- information.

MS. PENDERGRASS: With -- The minutes with those three corrections made, do I hear a question, a motion on the floor?

MR. TOMPKINS: I so move.

MR. CAMPBELL: I second.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I actually have a motion.

Okay. Any other discussion regarding the minutes?

All right. All in favor of accepting the

minutes dated January 23rd, 2003, with the three amended sections, all in favor, say, "Aye."

THE BOARD: Aye.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?

Any abstentions tonight? One abstention, please? Two abstentions. Thank you. Three abstentions. All right.

All right. We'll move to review of the action items. And let's see. We didn't have any carryover items, but we had a couple new ones: Additional information and clarification regarding how much money in contracts had been awarded to the community.

Mr. Forman, was that something that you were going to provide?

MR. FORMAN: That was something that the contract specialists are working on for the next subcommittee, the Economic -- excuse me -- the next Economic Development Subcommittee.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Then we need to amend that action item to reflect that the Item 1 on these new items is not really an action item for the RAB but an action item for the subcommittee.

All right. Amended to the action item, how does the City of San Francisco's first-choice hiring policy apply to the Shipyard?

Again, this seems to apply to this committee. Does it not? Mr. Mason?

MR. ATTENDEE: No.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Maurice. I'm sorry. Wasn't that one of your --?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. Yes, it does. I think more than a subcommittee it's for the general RAB. The -- the dollar amounts affect the -- the local community. That's the general RAB review-type thing after -- after that information is put together.

MS. PENDERGRASS: But what does that have to do with the cleanup of the Shipyard?

And it's my understanding that the purview of this board is the cleanup of the Shipyard.

So what does the first-choice policy have to do with the cleanup? I'm just trying to make sure I'm clear.

MR. CAMPBELL: First-choice hiring?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: First-choice hiring is how many of the people get hired to do the cleanup.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I understand what it is. I'm saying, but --

MR. CAMPBELL: What's the question?

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- should that not be

discussed in the -- in the subcommittee? Because it's --

MR. CAMPBELL: It can be, but I think it has to come out in a formal report to that RAB so it is very clear what's taking place.

MS. PENDERGRASS: So I see an action item that you'd like this on the agenda for the subcommittee and that you'd like a report?

MR. CAMPBELL: We want a formal Economic Subcommittee full report on all of these things with the Navy's responses.

MR. FORMAN: Yeah, Maurice, it was unclear to me. That's the Navy response or City of San Francisco's response on -- on their -- their first-choice hiring policy?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, first-choice hiring is San Francisco's, okay. But what we're trying to do and what we're going to do is: You've got a bunch of contractors that are representing the Navy DBE qualifications. We want to make sure that these DBE qualifications are working under the guidance of San Francisco's --

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: I think the best -- the best most effective way to handle that, in my opinion, is: Since

that's a technical contracting issue and -- and that type of issue rather than a -- a cleanup issue, why don't we work that out with the senior contract specialist and the base commander at the subcommittee meeting?

And then you as a subcommittee chair can report that to the -- everybody at the next RAB as to what happened, whether you're satisfied or not, and what the answers are.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: But again, that's moved to the agenda for the subcommittee with a report to follow. All right? So those are removed at this point.

Any other questions about action items or something that doesn't appear?

All right. Then we're going to move right along into the Navy announcements.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Yeah. Couple of things. We're going to concentrate tonight on a technology we're using on one of the plumes on Parcel C, and Pat Brooks will be giving that presentation.

But on Parcel E on the -- on landfill gas, we are not doing the presentation tonight, as you know, because of the -- what else is on the agenda.

But I do recommend that you turn to our Web

site again. We have completed the fourth week of the weekly monitoring phase where we go out with field instruments and monitor at the landfill, and we have those results, and they are posted to the Web site.

But we are following our action memorandum that we talked about. And the action memorandum says: After the fourth week, something special happens. You go out. You monitor. But in addition to monitoring, you go out and take actual samples. So we took air samples as well that are going to go to the lab on those gas-monitoring probes.

And in addition to that, what we do is: We continue monitoring now, but we go to the next phase of monitoring, which is monthly monitoring per the action memorandum.

If there's questions about that, I think that that's another possible topic for the next Technical Subcommittee meeting when we can present more on that there. But you're welcome to go to the Web site.

Second item quickly is: I talked to Lynne Brown, and I think one of the things I'd like to offer up as a suggestion is: It's difficult -- If the Navy's going to be invited to a subcommittee meeting -- and we enjoy being invited, and -- and we like doing that; but if you're a subcommittee chair and -- and you are pretty

sure you want the Navy or somebody representing the Navy or one of our contractors at the subcommittee meeting, can you go ahead and reach out to Dave or I ahead of the RAB?

And that way when you post the date up here for your subcommittee meeting, we already know that we can make the date, because the potential problem we've had is: If you notice, sometimes subcommittee meetings occur on the same day, or they are clustered in two or three days when we are also doing some other -- something else here.

So it would be good only if you need the Navy there and you want to lock in Dave or I or anybody else from the Navy, go ahead prior to the RAB, and let's coordinate a date so that we can all be there; and I think it will work a little smoother. Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Lynne?

MR. BROWN: I don't have any topics.

MR. MASON: I have a comment. I have a comment.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, it's not your time yet, but we'll make an exception just for you.

MR. MASON: Thank you. Thank you.

And -- and I appreciate that, Keith, because we have been trying to get you and Dave DeMars to the

Economic Committee for quite some time. But what happened was: We cancelled out on the 12th. You guys set a date for the 19th, and you canceled out on that. That was a tech date -- Tech later on but that evening. I understand you were up here, but we didn't get the privilege of having you at our economic meeting.

MR. FORMAN: No problem, Jesse. And Maurice Campbell's already taken care of that. In fact, on March 12th now at 3 p.m., we're all locked in.

MR. MASON: Fantastic.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Before we move on to our presentation, at this point just want to give folks a chance -- who have not introduced themselves who have just come in a chance to do so, because we have a few late RAB members.

MS. FRANKLIN: Oh. Good afternoon. My name is Marie J. Franklin.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. ASHER: My name is Lani Asher.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there anybody else?

MR. MORRISON: James Morrison.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: That's Jesse's [indicating].

MS. PENDERGRASS: Anybody over here? We're kind of going back to introductions, because we -- a lot

of people weren't here.

MS. PETERSON: She's over there now.

MR. CAPOBRES: RAB members?

MR. ATTENDEE: Everyone.

MS. PENDERGRASS: We're looking -- I'm looking over here.

MR. CAPOBRES: Don Capobres, Redevelopment Agency.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you so much.

Caroline Washington? Okay.

Anybody else? Okay.

MR. MASON: Yes, right here.

MS. HARRISON: Excuse me, I didn't introduce myself.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Please introduce yourself tonight. We haven't seen you in a while.

MS. HARRISON: Well, and this is true. But know that I've been working very diligently, very hard, for my community. So I've been here, just not in this room.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Thank you.

MS. PIERCE: Karen Pierce.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay, Karen.

MR. TERZIAN: Dave Terzian. I work with the

artists at the Shipyard. I represent and assist with The Point management.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. Welcome.

All right.

MS. BROWNELL: I have a quick announcement. It's sort of a follow-up from the report that the Health Department gave last month.

As Dr. Bhatia mentioned at the time, it was -- it's a draft report, and we would welcome anyone's input from that report. So if you have any input, comments, corrections, anything you would like to get to us, please get with me. I can give you my e-mail or phone number, whatever you need, and so we can get that report finalized.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Very good. And one more housekeeping: Again, please remember to sign in as RAB member on the list in the back, and all of the subcommittee reports as well as agendas are on the table.

All right. We'll turn it over to Patrick.

MR. BROOKS: Can you all hear me? If I just speak loudly, I don't have to hang onto the microphone.

MR. TISDELL: Sure, if you talk loud.

MR. BROOKS: All right. I'm Pat Brooks. Some of you might remember, I was here about a year ago

talking about some innovative groundwater cleanup technologies that we -- that we wanted to try out here at the Shipyard. And so tonight I'm coming back, and I want to give you the preliminary results of one of them that we've used over at Parcel C.

And it's -- Quick on the trigger there, Doug.

And it's an innovative cleanup of trichloroethene in groundwater, using iron injection. So we tried to use something that's safe and innocuous, iron, to break down the main chemical that's in the groundwater there, the main contaminant, trichloroethene.

Okay. Next side.

This is just a presentation outline for you. We'll just go over the location, where we did the treatability study, some background, some of the primary objectives. There are some other objectives in the study; but because the study's not yet completed, I don't have all the data to go over everything.

I want to explain a little bit about the chemistry of how we actually break down and destroy these contaminants, talk to you a little bit about the injection methodology, how we -- how we get the iron into the ground and down into the groundwater where it can treat the contamination.

And then I want to show you the existing conditions, you know, where we started out before the treatability study took place, what did the -- what were the groundwater conditions.

And then I want to show you the initial results -- we got some initial results that are very interesting -- and then just some preliminary conclusions.

Okay. Here we are. Hunters Point Shipyard. Our site is going to be over here somewhere.

Next slide, please.

Here we are again. This is Dry Dock 4, and here's our building where the treatability study took place. That's Building 272 on Parcel C.

Next slide, please.

Okay. Some background: Back when I first took this position, I was encouraged to fill out a proposal to try out some innovative technologies. The proposal went out Navy-wide. Two proposals were selected, and one was actually funded in 2001. This is the only technology, the only proposal, that actually gained funding. So we were very happy about that.

TCE is the primary contaminant at the site. TCE, or trichloroethene, is the solvent, the chlorinated solvent, used to remove grease and sludge and that kind

of thing off metal parts.

Our project team: Keith Forman, Dave DeMars, myself. Dr. D. B. Chan up in Port Hueneme was one of our technical advisors. At Tetra Tech: Our project manager John McCall, quality assurance guy, Greg Swanson. Don Cheng and Debbie Chen have also helped out a lot. And ARS Technologies, they're our contractor who actually put the iron into the ground. Steve Chen is the project manager on this project.

So our primary objectives are: See if we can use iron injection to clean up the trichloroethene in the groundwater. That's probably the main objective.

We want to evaluate whether the contamination is moved when we do inject the iron. When you -- when you inject a volume into the plume, it could have the possibility of pushing the plume away. So we want to look at that.

And we want to evaluate the size of the treatment zone, because that, of course, translates back into how much is it going to cost to clean the entire contamination.

Next slide.

Okay. It's -- It looks complicated, but it's not unless you know a little bit about chemistry, and I only know a little bit.

So what happens is: We inject some iron into the ground. Here's our iron. When it corrodes, it gives up a couple of electrons. It doesn't have any charge here at all. Ends up with a plus-2 charge and has to give up two electrons.

Okay. What takes those electrons? We have chlorines here, trichloroethene, so it's got three chlorines on the molecule. It's gonna pick up those electrons, and then it goes to the chloride ion, just like what we have in seawater. And we get a -- we get ethene here as a by-product also.

So we put iron in. We destroy the contamination. And we get out these harmless by-products of ethene and chloride. So seems pretty cool if it works.

MR. TOMPKINS: Excuse me. Is it ferrous oxide --?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can we save the questions till the end of the presentation?

MR. TOMPKINS: I'm just trying to get what chemical he has on the board.

In other words, he is putting ferrous oxide in it?

MR. BROOKS: Just -- We put in zero valent --

(Interruption.)

MR. BROOKS: We put in the zero valent iron, and it corrodes to ferric fair iron. Two plus.

Okay. Next side.

And thanks for not asking me any too complicated kind of questions.

Here's a -- here's a blowup here of what the iron looks like. It's got an irregular shape. It's got a lot of surface area for contact with contaminated water. That's what we want. Particles are very small. There are 40 micron particles. Feels like flour when you put some in your hands.

High purity iron: It's got a little trace of carbon in the particle structure. We get it from a vendor in Japan where they mine it and mill it there in Japan. Comes from a hematite mine, an iron mine.

And this is the methodology that we use to put the iron into the ground. This is where it does get a little bit complicated and requires some special machinery.

The first step is: We like to open up the formation by injecting nitrogen gas into the aquifer. We do that for about 10 to 15 seconds. This kind of pushes the nitrogen gas into the pore spaces where the water is, and it opens some new pore spaces as well.

So following that initial nitrogen injection,

then an iron-water slurry is introduced to that nitrogen gas stream that's going down into the aquifer. I got some pictures of it. It will make it a little bit clearer.

And the nitrogen acts as a carrier fluid to atomize this slurry and disperse it into the aquifer all throughout the contamination. And it's -- it makes for a good contact between the iron and the contaminants, and that's what we want to see.

When we started out, we thought that we'd get about a 20-foot radius of influence. In other words, we inject iron here, 20 feet all around that injection zone. That's what we're thinking we're going to get as a radius and influence or a treatment zone based on the prior experience of the contractor who does the injection.

Okay, next slide.

Okay. Here's Building 272. These are our nitrogen storage tanks. This is what supplies the nitrogen for this treatability study; and we kept it parked outside, hose going through the building here.

Next slide.

Here we have a pressure reduction manifold. Those tanks are under very high pressure, probably 1,000, maybe 2,000 psi. I don't recall. But the

pressure reduction manifold knocks that down in something more usable that you can actually put down into the aquifer. So that's our manifold.

Next slide.

Here's our iron-water-nitrogen slurry mixer. What we have is bags of iron here. The iron bags come with about 70 pounds of iron. And we got water coming in here [indicating], potable water. They dump the iron in. It mixes all up; and then when they're ready to put it down into the aquifer, down into the contamination, then they release the nitrogen, combines with the nitrogen, and blows it down to the subsurface.

Next slide.

Here's our injection well, and this is how we control where the -- where the iron goes. We start it from the -- We drilled the -- we drilled the injection borings about 33 feet deep. We started at the bottom where the contamination was the least concentrated.

And we have a device called a packer. So this pipe is holding our soil boring open. We got the packer assembly down here. These two tubes are what is used to inflate the packer. It's like two balloons, for lack of a better example, that blow up, against the soil; and you've got a 3-foot interval that the nitrogen and the iron slurry blows into the contaminated groundwater.

So we are only doing 3 feet at a time. We start at the bottom where the contamination is the least concentrated, and we work up.

Next slide.

Just one of the guys recording the injection pressure over here on the computer.

Next slide, please.

This is from our work plan, and this is -- this is, like, where we started. This is what we knew about it before we did any pre-injection monitoring of the groundwater conditions.

These -- these groundwater concentrations represented, oh, maybe data over a year, a year and a half, that we've put together to try to get an idea of what things look like out there and then what our treatment zones would look like in the green if we -- if we had a 20-foot radius of influence. So this is -- this is where we are starting, trying to make our plans here.

Next slide.

Again, just a cross-sectional diagram. This is where we think our treatment zone's going to be here, here in the -- in the green. We try to get down here low underneath most of the high concentrations of the contamination. That kind of lays a blanket of iron out

there so we don't force anything deeper. That was one of our concerns, don't --

MS. BUSHNELL: Can I -- can I ask what the scale of this is, I mean, how -- what is the dimensions of how big it is?

MR. BROOKS: This is 5 feet here, and I believe the -- I believe the horizontal scale is the same as the vertical scale. The plume in Building 272 is quite small. That's what made it a good candidate for treatability study. It's got high concentrations in the center, but --

Can we go back one side there?

This is probably only about 10 or 15 feet here across the hot spots. It's not big.

MS. BUSHNELL: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: So that made it an ideal candidate to go in there and see if this technology is going to work. If it's going to work, maybe we can apply it somewhere else. So we choose a nice small size plume where we can just get information on the chemistry and the effectiveness.

Okay. Let's go.

Part of the work plan, we did a bunch of groundwater sampling before we did any of the injections. We wanted to know a bunch of different

things about the chemistry in the aquifer. I'm only going to show you here the trichloroethene in groundwater.

You can see here we have 50,000 micrograms per liter in our hot spot area, yet one of the wells actually came up 88,000 micrograms per liter. It's pretty darn high.

Again, not a huge -- not a huge plume. There's -- It looks like it's going to be 7 1/2 feet right there. So it's just not very big.

MS. SUMCHAI: How does that --?

MR. BROOKS: And it just --

MS. SUMCHAI: -- how that compares with the groundwater contamination in Mountain View where it's going into homes.

MR. BROOKS: You know, I don't know, but this is pretty high. I'm -- I would just -- I'm just going to guess -- I don't know, but I think this is probably higher. This is pretty high.

MS. BROWNELL: But a smaller area.

MR. BROOKS: Very small area. Very, very small area, which made it good.

MS. LUTTON: This is liquid or gas?

MR. BROOKS: The trichloroethene? It's actually dissolved in the groundwater. It's like, you

know, shaking salt in water. It dissolves.

MS. MENACK: But I think the question you're asking is, can it be in the gas phase? And it can be --

MR. BROOKS: Yeah.

MS. MENACK: -- between the water table and the ground surface like it was in Mountain View where it's going into homes.

MR. BROOKS: Yeah. Yeah, that's real true. I should have picked up on that, but . . .

What we measured here is in the water; but because it is a volatile organic compound, it does like to exist in the gas phase too. So . . .

Next slide.

This is the cool one. Here is after the first round of injections. And remember we had the 50,000 micrograms per liter over here? It's totally gone, totally missing.

What we have here this -- now, if you're just looking at the map, you're thinking: Okay, well, here's our hot spot over here. Maybe it's been displaced or something.

What I think is happening over here is: We've just got better treatment in this area, and this is -- this is being treated also only maybe not quite as effective as this stuff over here.

Let -- let's switch back. Go back up one slide.

There's our pre-injection. 50,000, 5,000, 500. Pretty concentrated area of contamination.

Okay, go back to the old one.

This is after only three weeks of treatment. Three weeks and we really -- we really knocked it down. So we saw this data and we thought: What a great presentation to give and show you what we're doing.

MR. FORMAN: Watch out, he's bragging.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, next slide.

Now we get to some of the boring graphs. Here's one of the hot spot wells, 78,000 micrograms per liter. This number we -- We took two samples for the high number. Little bit different. We averaged them, 78,000.

And what we do is: We look at a couple of things. Remember earlier I said that when the iron corrodes, it gives off some electrons. And those electrons go to those chlorines and -- and break them off of the trichloroethene molecule. That's how it becomes treated. That's how it destroys the contamination.

So we're measuring what we call ORP, or oxidation reduction potential. It's measured in

millivolts. We want to see a low number here. Low numbers mean that we've got -- that the treatment is working. The iron's breaking down. Chlorines are able to grab those free electrons and break off the trichloroethene molecules.

So we start up here with an initial reading of 166.3 on the ORP, and our initial concentration is 78,000.

After about three weeks, you can see we're all the way down here to minus 555. So we're thinking: Whew, this is great. And our concentration's down to 360.

So latest reading, climb back up a little bit back up to 730. This is not something that's unusual in the first rounds of monitoring, according to my contractor. Sometimes you just see a little -- a little rise, and then it will just continue to tail off.

This iron is effective and it will keep corroding, producing these low ORP values or this one right here [indicating] for about two years. So it's got some staying power.

So that's our hot spot well. Looking pretty good. It came down about a hundred times in three weeks.

Here is a mid plume well. Same kind of story.

The oxygen -- or excuse me. Oxidation reduction potential: Again, it's decreasing. Looks like you got again about a factor of a hundred reduction in three weeks. It's coming back up just a little bit. Looks a lot like the old one that we just saw. Oxidation reduction potential continues to go down.

Here is our vertical plume displacement well. Remember, I said we wanted to lay that blanket of iron down deep to keep -- to keep the contamination from being spread vertically. We lay the blanket down; then we continue injecting as we pull up 3 feet by 3 feet. But if any contamination gets moved, it gets moved down into that treatment blanket. So we are extremely happy to see this.

We start out here at 39 micrograms per liter. Drop down to 30. Climbs back up to about 42. Not too serious. Looking pretty good as far as vertical plume displacement.

Okay. Next slide.

Horizontal plume displacement. Here's one of our wells, 8 to 5 to 4. Again some reductions in the oxidation reduction potential. So no horizontal plume displacement here at this well.

Next slide.

Another horizontal plume displacement well.

Goes from 3 to 17, staying tight at 17. So again, not too bad.

Next one.

Another well: .3, 4, down to .5 again.

So we're doing -- we're in pretty good shape for both the vertical displacement and horizontal displacement. We successfully reduced the hot spot area by about 100 times in just three weeks. We don't have spreading. It's looking pretty sweet.

Next slide.

So our preliminary conclusions -- We have -- We still have a bunch of data to crunch through, so I can't really report on the entire treatability study. There's other things that we're looking at.

But the iron injection caused a large reduction in the TCE contamination in the groundwater in a short time.

The contaminants showed little movement due to the injections. In other words, the contamination wasn't pushed out away from the injection.

The radius of influence, it ranged from about 15 to 20 feet. So we are in the ballpark of where we thought we were going to be, maybe, you know, a little bit less in some cases.

And then probably the other -- the other cool

part about this is: It's an innovative technology that can be applied at other groundwater plumes at Hunters Point. There's one at Parcel B that we would like to try it on. It's the one over by Building 123. It's kind of a -- The primary contaminant is TCE again. It doesn't work on all the contaminants, but it works real good on TCE.

And so we're looking at our groundwater plumes and seeing where this technology can be applicable again.

MS. PENDERGRASS: We have time for maybe about four or five questions and then . . .

Start here, Mr. Brooks.

MS. OLIVA: Mr. Brooks . . . [unintelligible].

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can you speak a little bit louder?

THE REPORTER: I can't hear at all.

MS. PENDERGRASS: We need to give you the mic.

MR. BROOKS: Here's the microphone. Maybe you could . . .

MS. OLIVA: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Maybe you can call me Pat.

MS. OLIVA: Okay, Pat. You said that this process has the staying power of two years? You said that the staying power's for two years?

MR. BROOKS: Yeah, that's correct. The --

MS. OLIVA: Will it return?

MR. BROOKS: Will the TCE return?

MS. OLIVA: Mm-hmm.

MR. BROOKS: No. That -- What I meant by the "staying power" is: The iron has the staying power of about two years. So it's continuing to release these electrons into the groundwater and pluck the chlorine atoms off of the TCE molecules.

MS. OLIVA: So the iron dissipates?

MR. BROOKS: The iron corrodes. The iron corrodes; and once it gets corroded, then it's not effective anymore. Kind of like your -- the fenders on your car. Once they get corroded, they are no good anymore. Same thing here.

MS. OLIVA: All right. And you also mentioned that Building 273?

MR. BROOKS: This --

MS. OLIVA: 272?

MR. BROOKS: This building is 272.

MS. OLIVA: Has that been monitored or cleansed of any other contaminants in it before you went in there?

MR. BROOKS: This building is primarily -- We've done just tons of testing in there. This building

is primarily trichloroethene.

MS. OLIVA: It's full of it?

MR. BROOKS: No. I say it's "primarily." That means it's not mixed up with a bunch of other contaminations.

MS. OLIVA: Could you -- Can you repeat that again?

MR. BROOKS: There are some -- Some groundwater plumes you might have -- you might have some TCE. You might have a gasoline spill. There might be a fuel spill. There can be, you know, different things in the groundwater.

But this particular groundwater plume is mostly -- the con- -- the main contaminants is mostly trichloroethene.

MS. OLIVA: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: We have another question.

Mr. Campbell.

MR. CAMPBELL: You were doing SVE. And the thing about S- -- soil vapor extraction is: Unless you found the source, you could have a reoccurring situation.

And I'm questioning -- I guess my question is: If you don't hit the -- exactly the source and you got a

two-year before the ferrous oxide is out, then what happens?

MR. BROOKS: Well, then you go back. But remember, the purpose of this treatability study has not been done a lot. And they have used it in other applications, but this particular application is pretty dang new; so we just wanted to see if this would be effective against our contamination.

This isn't meant to treat the entire plume all at once. It's meant only to test the technology. If we see that it works, we throw some more contracts at it --

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure.

MR. BROOKS: -- and we go back with more injection borings, and we do the things that you're talking about.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, but SVE, SVE was to test the technology also.

MR. BROOKS: True.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So you're saying this is two testing technologies?

MR. BROOKS: This is -- this is -- well, this technology was for the iron injection.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. BROOKS: The soil vapor extraction works in the soil above the groundwater vapors.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. BROOKS: So it is important to recognize where your source is for soil vapor extraction.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. BROOKS: There are some limitations to using it. When you have a shallow groundwater table, you put a vacuum on something, pull up the water table, and then your soil's not able to be -- have air pass through it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So the -- the last part of the question is: Has this been done successfully as a conclusive remediation anywhere?

MR. BROOKS: The iron injection?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: Oh, yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.

MR. BROOKS: Now, that -- a handful of sites. If you go on the Internet and you type in zero valent irons, something like that, things will start popping up. It's probably not going to be more than four or five, but there is some stuff out there.

MR. TOMPKINS: I have one question. In terms of the data that you presented; and given that TCE is also a VOC, I haven't seen any measurements for air monitoring above ground in terms of that.

Since you're increasing ground pressure by 100,000, 200,000 psi, is there any air monitoring up above for this to escape to the atmosphere?

MR. BROOKS: Yeah, we do do -- we do do air monitoring. "We do do." We --

MR. TOMPKINS: Do do, do do, do do. No. I just didn't see --

MR. BROOKS: Yeah.

MR. TOMPKINS: -- in the presentations. So --

MR. BROOKS: No.

MR. TOMPKINS: -- there -- I didn't know what was inferred.

MR. BROOKS: There's just a ton of data here that didn't get presented. But we do air monitoring. You know, we have standard health and safety protocols that we follow for our workers. Anybody who has worked with me on the Shipyard knows that that's my first priority is health and safety, and I have -- I've left boot tracks on more than one person because they didn't --

MR. TOMPKINS: Was there an increase?

MR. BROOKS: No.

MR. TOMPKINS: Well, just as it was in operation.

MR. BROOKS: And it came in at about three --

three, four hundred psi. That was the injection pressure.

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. Was there any increase in terms of atmospheric contamination?

MR. BROOKS: None that was --

None that we picked up.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins, I think you have a couple more questions.

So Miss Harrison and then over here.

MS. HARRISON: Actually, Mr. Tompkins asked one of my questions. But my other -- and I have two.

One, I wanted to know the cost of this process, of this testing.

MR. BROOKS: I couldn't find the microphone.

MS. HARRISON: I -- Not a problem. I wanted to know the cost of the process.

And then something you need to explain to me: You said that in one of those slides, you show where it dissipated, and then it came back; it went back up. Is it coming back with --?

Once your -- Once the groundwater is removed, it -- it's soaked up in this iron stuff. Is that being replaced with new groundwater?

Once new groundwater moves in there, it's then causing this to spike back up, or is it because this is

starting to corrode already and releases again?

MR. BROOKS: Let me see if I get the question. Was the question is what's causing the spike-up?

MS. HARRISON: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: The spike-up, we believe, is caused because when you inject all the nitrogen in the water slurry in there, it's just mixing stuff up. It mixes stuff up, and it'll cause a temporary rise; and this is something our injection contractor said he's seen at several of his other experimental sites.

So we're expecting it to dip up -- not "dip up" -- rise up a little bit and then go back down. So we're going to continue the monitoring.

Unfortunately, that's all the data that I have. I -- All the data I have I'm sharing with you tonight.

MS. HARRISON: Let me have the cost for this.

MR. BROOKS: The cost is -- One of the -- one of the things that we are going to produce at the end of this test is co- -- cost-and-performance evaluation, and so it will come out then. Ballpark figures: a few hundred thousand, half a million, something like that --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. BROOKS: -- for everything.

MS. HARRISON: Few hundred or half a million? What have you spent so far?

MR. BROOKS: Well, that's why I'm telling you -- that's why I'm telling you that our final deliverable is a cost-and-performance evaluation.

And it's difficult to kind of separate, okay, if we have to drill additional monitoring wells, is that part of the treatment technology? If we have to do extra sampling that we might not have to do because we have proved it doesn't -- it doesn't have an impact, and so you go back in the next time, and you don't have to sample that.

I mean, it's more complicated than just telling you, you know, how much does it cost.

What do we include in the cost? That's -- that's -- We're in the middle of a study, and the final deliverable is called the cost-and-performance analysis technology.

MS. HARRISON: Maybe the question should have been: Is there a dollar amount you're not allowed to go?

MR. BROOKS: No.

MS. HARRISON: So you can go from now to --

MR. TOMPKINS: -- eternity.

MR. BROOKS: Well, you know, eventually somebody's going to laugh me out of my office, and I'm going to be sweeping sidewalks.

MS. PENDERGRASS: But basically, the bottom line is that you'll spend what it takes to get it clean?

MR. BROOKS: Well, what we look towards -- I mean, in this iron injection, this is really a pretty economical way to treat a plume, especially at this size and these concentrations. This is an economical way to go. Trichloroethene is not an easy contaminant to remove from groundwater, but this looks like it's being very effective.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Next question over here, please.

MR. MANUEL: Yes. I'm sorry for being a little bit late. I came from meeting and bad traffic, but . . .

If I understand you, the iron is acting as kind of a consumable similar to what you would get when you mix, like, isopropyl alcohol with -- with the gasoline, extracting the water that may be in the gasoline.

So it's kind of a consumable that have a certain amount of life, and then from there you would extract it and -- and reinsert fresh iron to consume the contamination that's in -- in the -- in the ground? Is that -- is that what I'm hearing?

MR. BROOKS: Yeah, that's correct. The iron has a certain life down the aquifer, because the job of

the iron is to corrode.

MR. MANUEL: Right.

MR. BROOKS: It contacts with water. Its job is to corrode and release the electrons so the chlorines on the trichloroethene molecule --

MR. MANUEL: Right.

MR. BROOKS: -- can -- can grab onto an electron and -- and become released.

MR. MANUEL: Yeah, they -- It corrodes also with -- with the atmosphere. So it would work both ways.

But I guess my question is: Is that --? Have you assessed how much -- approximately how much contamination there is and what period of time -- assuming this works, what period of time it would take for a completion of this particular site with this process?

MR. BROOKS: Not yet, because, you know, I'm -- I'm just so happy with the technology that I want to make having -- give you the results midway into the study.

MR. MANUEL: Okay. Well, I guess we should be fair to you and get your thing done.

MR. BROOKS: We are not at the end of the study yet.

MS. PENDERGRASS: One last question, please.

MR. MASON: And my question is: What's your definition of "not too bad"? I heard you mention that in one of the slides.

MR. BROOKS: When --? Where did I say it?

MR. MASON: "Not too bad."

MR. BROOKS: I mean, what -- in what context?

MR. MASON: In one of the slides, you were saying you -- you were saying --

MR. BROOKS: Oh, oh, horizontal displacement.

MR. MASON: Yeah.

MR. BROOKS: Yeah. Stuff like that.

MR. FORMAN: It went from 39 to 42.

MR. BROOKS: You know, let's say 20 feet away I've got 20,000 micrograms per liter in the groundwater, and I'm -- I take my measurement over here at 20 feet away. I'm looking at -- I think originally it was .3, one of them.

And so I got the potential at this .3 well to see several thousand micrograms per liter if -- you know, if I screw up. But when it only comes up to 5, I'm thinking, that ain't too bad.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. All right. We're going to take a break at this point, please. Our question-and-answer period is over, and then we'll have

the following presentation by Mr. Lino. So we'll take ten minutes, please, and come back at 7:05.

(Recess 6:55 p.m. to 7:07 p.m.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can we bring the meeting back to order?

MS. PETERSON: No.

MS. PENDERGRASS: At this point in the agenda, we have a presentation. We have a change. Our presenter won't be Laurie Lowman. It will be -- Commander?

MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Commander Lino Fragoso.

Yes, ma'am. All right.

Commander, welcome. All right. You have until about 7:15.

CDR. FRAGOSO: All right. Good evening. Microphone.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Do you need a microphone, sir?

CDR. FRAGOSO: No. I think . . .

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I --

CDR. FRAGOSO: Can you all hear me?

MS. PENDERGRASS: No.

MR. ATTENDEE: No.

MS. RINES: No.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: There you go.

CDR. FRAGOSO: I have an accent if you haven't noticed.

First of all, Laurie and Dick weren't able to be here tonight. Laurie fell sick last Sunday, so I will be -- I'll try to give her presentation.

So what I'm going to do tonight is actually give you an update from last month on where we are in the HRA and some of the other surveys that we are performing right now.

First of all, I'm Commander Lino Fragoso, and I'm a radiation health officer in the Medical Service Corps. I'm the officer in charge of the Radiological Affairs Support Office. I'm actually Dick and Laurie's boss.

It's kind of interesting because I just came from the Shipyard where I was a deputy director of radiation health, and prior to that I was at RASO also where Dick Lowman was my boss. I was environmental protection manager at that point, and I actually came to one of the first RAB meetings actually at Treasure Island from Hunters Point. That was close to ten years ago. So things go around.

It's always nice to be in the Bay Area. I

actually studied here. I went to U.C.-Berkeley, and it almost feels like coming back home.

We're going to do -- We are going to go through three radiological issues tonight, actually. We are going to see how we are with the preparation of the draft final HRA. That's the Historical Radiological Assessment. We're going to go -- we're going to go through a couple of issues, the radiological site work that we have tonight, and maybe some of the new areas of investigation.

Of course, you know, what -- why a draft final HRA? We have a commitment to the community to produce an accurate and comprehensive Historical Radiological Assessment. The reason why we need a Historical Radiological Assessment is because it gives us a snapshot in time of what the situation here is and NRDL at certain point.

The reason why we have to do it is because there's a large amount of radioisotopes in the world. We need to pinpoint those isotopes that are of interest to us so we can actually select the type of detection instrumentation that we need in order to do the remediation that is necessary.

What are our efforts? Well, right now we are addressing the comments that were received from the

draft HRA. We're going to be incorporating some of the newly discovered historical information. There's a large amount of information that has just been declassified by the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense, and we are actually going to be interviewing some former workers.

We are going to be addressing some of the comments received from, of course, the regulatory agencies, from DHS, DTSC, City of San Francisco, the developer, and some of the concerned citizens. This will be coming to you by March 7. So it will be arriving in your lap pretty soon.

We have discovered that we have additional information for several different locations. As a matter of fact, we have people now traveling to different places. We have Peter Sum [phonetic] of the New World Technology people who are actually looking at some of the regulatory [sic] in San Bruno.

We have contractors now working over in Port Molate Naval Shipyard, at the Navy yard in Washington. We have also people over at College Park in Maryland.

I signed the orders for one of my guys to go over to Sandia National Laboratory, and then from there he's going to go to Los Alamos National Laboratory; and after this here -- here going to San Bruno, they're

going to be traveling to Las Vegas to look at some of those newly declassified information.

We also have received the personal files of a former NRDL department head, Dr. Sharpcook [phonetic], who was writing a book about NRDL. We are very thankful to his family for having allow us to have his research.

Now, the advertisement for interviews: Actually, it went out to several newspapers in the Bay Area and Sacramento. And we wanted to find personnel who had knowledge about the situation here in Hunters Point, not only in NRDL, but also at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. Of course, you know, we have some CROSSROADS vessels that came from the atomic testing at Bikini that came -- that were actually decontaminated right here.

So we are looking for all of those personnel, and the response has been overwhelming. We have had 138 responses to the advertisement to this date. The responses have come from all over the country. We have responses from people in Hawaii, and we have responses from people actually in Richmond, Virginia.

The most interesting part is that the person who responded from Richmond, Virginia, she's 94 years old and was an ensign in the Navy in 1946, and she was actually situated here at Hunters Point.

We started -- Laurie started to do the

telephone interviews in February 19th. And even though we are starting to do all of the interviews, we still haven't stopped -- we still would like to have as many people call us as possible.

So we still have the 1-800 number available. And if -- if you -- if you find any other people that you would like to bring to us -- to our attention or just disseminate the work, Daryl DeLong over here from New World Technology -- you can also e-mail it to him or e-mail it to Laurie or to Dick or even myself, Lino Fragoso.

Now, going to some of the current field surveys, what we are trying to say here is that contrary to what we have done what you are accustomed to seeing with the chemical world, PCBs and TCEs, what we are doing here is a very dynamic process.

Not only we are doing the assessment, but at the same time, we are actually doing surveys. And at the same time that we are doing surveys, if we find contamination, we are doing remediation.

We are -- This is -- this is an overlapping process, something that is a little bit different than what you are accustomed to seeing. So that's what I want to convey in this -- in this slide.

We are going to -- We have -- In the last few

weeks, we have found a couple -- we are going to start doing surveys in a couple places, and the next one is -- we will be doing a survey in Building 253.

For those of you just to remind you where it is, this is Parcel C, 253. This is Dry Dock 2, 253. Some of you may recognize the building. It is actually called a periscope building. And this -- on the sixth and fifth floor, NRDL had some -- did some work.

On the sixth floor, NRDL had a calibration facility. Okay. All radiological instruments that NRDL needed to use had to be calibrated to detect radiation. So in order to calibrate them, they had sealed sources inside machines.

And what they did is: They had the instruments placed in front of the machine. They will expose the source. These are sealed sources. This is not actually a Pollard [phonetic] contamination. They are sealed sources. They will come up. They will actually check their electrical response with the instrument.

On the fifth floor, then we had a small instrument repair shop.

Well, do you remember at that time during the 19- -- actually starting during the 1920s all the way to -- to the 1960s, we used radioluminescent paint in most of our instruments. Radio -- The radioluminescent

paint actually had radium 226, which is an alpha emitter, and that actually at that alpha particle will hit a phosphor and create luminescence.

Well, what happens is that that phosphor after a while actually degrades and no longer glows up nice.

So what we had to do for most of the instruments that were used in the Navy -- actually for most -- almost everything in the United States, because you have to use those same instruments in the commercial flights -- is that you have to take those instruments out; you have to scrape that material out, and you have to repaint it in order to use it again.

So we had a small instrument repair shop on the fifth floor.

Now, most of our initial surveys are complete. And what we have discovered is that we have contamination in that area. We have cesium 137, which is a fission product; and we have radium 226, which is the radionuclide of concern for radioluminescent paint.

So we have found those on -- in those two areas and also on the -- on the roof of the -- of the building. We have cleanup point underway as we speak, and we are actually surveying the rest of the building.

The second one is Building 366 located right here [indicating]. This is Dry Dock 4. This is

Parcel D.

And next slide. This is just to remind you how it looks like. Actually, if you were able to focus on this area and read it, which I can't even read it from here, you will see that this is the small boat shop. It was a former boat and plastics shop. It's now currently being used by artists here in the Shipyard.

Then we have an initial survey done in this area. This was considered what -- what is called a Class 3, a low-risk, area at that time when we did the surveys. So the surveys were done as a Class 3, which required only 20 percent of the area to be surveyed.

Now, what we -- what happened is that some -- we found some historical records. Now, those historical records have indicated to us that some -- there was some storage of radioluminescent paint in that area. And we find that out, now that bumps it up.

So now what we have to do is: We have to go back and do more surveys, and we are in the process of doing that. We will be in the process of doing that in the near future.

Now, what's next? Well, of course, we are going to continue to do our HRA research and the interviews, and we are going to continue the on-site radiological surveys and cleanup as we do the HRA

research.

And ultimately we want to keep you all informed, and we will be coming here and -- every -- every month to update you on what's going on in the radiological surveys. Hopefully, by next month, Laurie and Dick will be able to attend.

There's one thing I want to -- I've been asked to read from Dick, if I . . . These have a tint, so it's very difficult to see in low lighting.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bayview-Hunters Point RAB:

I am sorry that I cannot be there personally to relay this message to you. My wife, Laurie, and I were scheduled to be there. However, she had an illness come up this past Sunday that may require immediate surgery to correct.

I was very moved by your actions and want to thank each and every one of you for the card and words of encouragement for me and my health.

As a last thought, for now I would like to say that you have had some excellent community co-chairs of the RAB in the past. But I think Mr. Lynne Brown serves you very

well. He's a caring and passionate man about the welfare of the community, and I will say that if every community had more people like him, it would be a far better world to live in.

Dick Lowman.

(Applause.)

I received word this morning that actually Laurie will be having surgery next Thursday.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

We have two questions here and two here. If you keep your questions to one or two, that would be great. Thank you.

MS. OLIVA: Thank you.

I'm concerned about you mentioned you're doing the surveys and remediation at the same time. And what kind of remediation is that?

Will there be any lab results on that?

Where is the -- the stuff going? When is --? Where is it going?

How is it going?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Okay.

MS. OLIVA: Or is it remaining there?

CDR. FRAGOSO: That's not a question. That's about five or six questions.

MS. OLIVA: I do that all the time.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Okay. First of all, remediation normally is something -- that is like radioactive contamination on a building. It stays on the surface.

This radioactive contamination, normally we have been able to remove it by scaffolding the concrete.

MS. OLIVA: Scouring?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Scaffolding, scaffolding. That means removing the concrete.

MS. OLIVA: So there's dust?

CDR. FRAGOSO: It -- Dust is formed. Normally we do this inside a tent.

MS. OLIVA: In- -- "Normally." Are you doing that in a tent here?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Well, we don't know yet.

MS. OLIVA: Oh, you haven't done it.

CDR. FRAGOSO: We haven't done it.

MS. OLIVA: Okay.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Okay? Normally it's done inside a tent to remove -- contain the dust.

Where it goes: Well, there are two places that the United States can receive low-level radioactive waste. One is in Washington State, and the other one is in South Carolina.

Being part of this area and being part of the federal government, as we still have Hunters Point, more

likely this -- actually -- I'm sorry. There's a third one, which is in Utah.

The one in Utah will be the most likely to receive the material from here. Utah receives construction materials that are contaminated with low levels of radioactive waste. So it's sent there.

If it was like a diode from an airplane or from a vessel, it will then go to South Carolina because they are the ones that receive that. But in the case of construction material, that always -- always goes to Utah.

Let me see if I get the rest of your question. How do we know if we have done -- if we have remediated completely? Is that --?

MS. OLIVA: Have you taken methods to analyze the residue that you've removed, and will you be able --

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yes.

MS. OLIVA: -- to guarantee those results?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yes, yes, yes. As a matter of fact, after you do the remediation, then we are required to do what's called a confirmation survey. So a full survey is done afterwards, and we -- with samples to make sure that all of the material has been removed.

MS. OLIVA: And will the public or the people be informed as to when and what time --

CDR. FRAGOSO: Oh, definitely.

MS. OLIVA: -- this will be removed and by what methods you truck it out?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yeah, definitely. I mean, the method that is not only trucked out, it's actually -- all of the material is -- packed in 55-gallon drums or actually a roll-off -- it depends on the amount of material that we have. If we have very little material that we're sending, we normally put it in 55-gallon drum, which is a DOT requirement, and send it.

If it's actually a large amount of material, then we have to use roll-off --

MS. OLIVA: The white bins.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yes.

MS. OLIVA: White bins. All right.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Asher?

MR. TOMPKINS: Push the button.

MS. ASHER: Hi. My name is Lani Asher. I'm an artist at the -- at the Shipyard. I notice you mention the building -- Building 366 that's used by artists. Are those artists that rent directly from the Navy, or are they artists that rent from the City of San Francisco?

And in what method do you inform them that they are in a contaminated building?

And what is the process around that whole thing? Are they still in the building?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Keith, will you answer that question for me, please?

MR. FORMAN: Yeah, not that I know too much of . . .

Is Mr. Terzian here?

MR. TERZIAN: Right here.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. The -- You are the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency point of contact?

MR. TERZIAN: Right.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. The initial -- First of all, there's no contamination necessarily at Building 366. We just need to go back to do another survey. There's already been two surveys in the past done, but this is just another survey to do, and this one is a hundred percent it's pretty comprehensive, the building.

The process that starts when that's identified is: A letter is sent out to the point of contact, who is, I believe, you.

MR. TERZIAN: We received it yesterday.

MR. FORMAN: Great. Okay. From there you then work with the building manager or . . .

MR. TERZIAN: We work with --

MR. FORMAN: -- the building manager, the person who's in charge of Building 366.

MR. TERZIAN: I guess that would be us.

MR. FORMAN: Is it? I mean, I -- okay. All right. And then --

MR. TERZIAN: We received a letter from Redevelopment yesterday --

MR. FORMAN: Okay.

MR. TERZIAN: -- alerting us that there was a potential problem of radioluminescent paint.

MR. FORMAN: Right, radioluminescent paint.

MR. TERZIAN: That's all we have been told. Apparently, there was a survey done in August of 2001.

MR. FORMAN: Yes.

MR. TERZIAN: We weren't aware of that. It was a 30 percent survey.

MR. FORMAN: Yes.

MR. TERZIAN: We were not -- we were not told that there was a survey done in the building, and this is actually the first hint I've heard about that.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Mr. DeLong?

MR. DeLONG: Yes. I talked with Dave on the phone.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. No. But I mean, what about the first survey? How is --?

MR. DeLONG: First survey -- The first survey, when we went into the building, the building was unlocked. We never went into any of the artists' rooms. We surveyed accessible areas.

MR. FORMAN: Back in 2001.

MS. OLIVA: What methods do you use to survey?

MR. DeLONG: It depends on what we're looking for.

MS. OLIVA: Well --

MR. DeLONG: If we're looking for -- If you have --

MS. OLIVA: -- uranium?

MR. DeLONG: You have gamma scans; you have alpha -- you're looking for all your radiological substances.

MS. PENDERGRASS: But you're also looking for those isotopes in the areas that were not occupied by people?

MR. DeLONG: Correct.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

CDR. FRAGOSO: We -- Depleted uranium, we do not work with depleted uranium. This is actually an area where we have found some radioluminescent material being stored. Now, just because -- let me explain a little bit about radioluminescent material, radium 226,

okay?

Radium 226 was very expensive to process. To produce 1 gram of radium 226, you have to start -- you have to start with 550 tons of ore. In 1926 dollars, it cost a million dollars for 1 gram of radium 226.

That was -- The reason why I know is because Madame Currie came over to the United States during that time, and the Daughters of the American Revolution gave her a gram of radium 226 to take back home to France, and it cost them $1 million. That's the only reason why I know. So it was kept under lock and key.

One of the things that it was a storage area, because it's a storage area, we have to go back and look at it. But it was kept under lock and key.

The way that they actually used it, it was taken out from the small vial. A little aliquot, a little amount of material, was taken out and was mixed with the paint and with some glue; and that's what was applied to the instruments.

Once that was done, that little vial went back under lock and key and was only controlled by certain people. But it's not like it was all over the place.

MS. OLIVA: I realize that.

MS. ASHER: I just -- I just want you to finish answering my question about the procedure that

Mr. Terzian, the building manager, has been notified; and does he have the proper information in order to make the decision around this, or how does this work?

MR. FORMAN: That is a good question. The letter has a point of contact. What happens here -- it's good question, Lani -- it comes from the Navy to SFRA, the Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency passes it on to the building manager, which is you, sir. I didn't quite know that. Okay.

And then it's his job -- of course, he will inform the artists based on what he knows in the letter and then what else he needs to determine what to do.

In this case, you had your assistant --

MR. TERZIAN: Deborah.

MR. FORMAN: -- Deborah call me yesterday, and I spoke with her --

MR. TERZIAN: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: -- and went over essentially the contents of the letter and the surveys.

And then New World Technologies will then be in touch with you with the schedule of what will be done, when it will be done, what needs to be done.

MR. TERZIAN: We're working on that. But what we're concerned about is --

MR. FORMAN: Sure.

MR. TERZIAN: -- are the tenants -- are they all at risk right now?

MR. FORMAN: No.

MR. TERZIAN: You said something about it being stored in Building 366 and a small amount is taken out and mixed with paint?

MR. FORMAN: Yes.

MR. TERZIAN: So the mixing process -- was the mixing process --?

MR. FORMAN: No. The -- the paint that -- that Commander Fragoso was referring to, that when it's taken out of the paint can and it's mixed with glue and it's painted on the radium dial, that doesn't occur where it's stored.

The records indicate that this is a potential place where it might have been stored. We don't even know that it was. But we're being -- you know, you're required to be very sure of these things. You have to go and survey just to make sure.

CDR. FRAGOSO: To let you know, the Navy requi- -- the Navy required in the 1930s that all of the paint that was going to be used for painting the dials had to be in the lab and had to be under a hood just because by that time, we already knew that radium actually caused cancer.

And the way we knew about it is because of the radium dial painters in New Jersey where they actually put the paint in their mouth and rolled up that paint brush, and they actually ingested a lot of radium. Radium -- radium is very similar to calcium. It deposits in the -- in the -- in the bones.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Excuse me. We have two more questions here, and then we're out of time. We'll have to talk about just time checks at that point. Excuse me. Excuse me. Let -- let the next person --

MS. ASHER: But I just -- I need to have my question finished.

I'd like to end this with I'd like the procedure perhaps to be presented to the RAB maybe next time about if -- if there are some issues dealing with tenants out at the Shipyard, what the procedure's going to be, and how decisions are made about that.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Well, how about why don't we talk about this after the meeting?

MS. ASHER: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: Would you like that? Because I think it's a timely thing to do.

MS. ASHER: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: It's a good thing to do. Okay? And then if we could have the proper people stay here --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. FORMAN: -- including Daryl and Martin. Okay.

MS. SUMCHAI: I'd also like to suggest that it be considered an item for the March 26th meeting of the Radiological Subcommittee.

MR. FORMAN: Good.

MS. SUMCHAI: There are some health and safety issues here that are time constrained.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. Very good.

MS. PENDERGRASS: So Miss Asher, you --

MR. FORMAN: Thanks.

MR. BROWN: I'd like to ask the -- has Dr. Cook's diary been any -- has it been any good? Have you found any radiological spots, hot spots, anything?

CDR. FRAGOSO: I can't say that. I can't answer your question right now. Sorry.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

CDR. FRAGOSO: I haven't reviewed the mat- -- The material right now is being catalogued mostly, okay? It will be reviewed within the next few weeks. So hopefully, by the next RAB with the radiological issues, Laurie can give you an update on how good the material has been.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell, can you keep your question to one?

MR. CAMPBELL: It's very short.

CDR. FRAGOSO: I'm sorry if I've taken too long.

MR. CAMPBELL: Commander Fragoso?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wanted to ask you -- welcome back to San Francisco, first of all.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: -- Building 253 --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell, you can speak louder than that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

Building 253, you talked about the roof of the building. Was that because of the exhaust vent of some kind?

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yes, sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: And so some of this stuff that is leaving from the fifth floor was being exhaust -- exhausted up to the roof and out?

CDR. FRAGOSO: I can't say that it was only from the fifth floor.

MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So it might have been --

CDR. FRAGOSO: We don't know yet.

MR. CAMPBELL: -- more --
CDR. FRAGOSO: We are going --
MR. CAMPBELL: -- from the ventilation shaft?
CDR. FRAGOSO: Yes, sir. We look -- We have to look in -- on the fourth floor. We have to look on some of the other floors to find from where exactly it's coming from.
MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.
CDR. FRAGOSO: From where exactly it came from.
MR. CAMPBELL: Sure. And there's a possibility it may have spread from the roof too?
CDR. FRAGOSO: Sir, I can assure you that it probably did.
MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.
MR. TOMPKINS: I have a question.
MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins --
MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.
MS. PENDERGRASS: -- we're out of time.
MR. TOMPKINS: Could we have extensions, then?
MS. PENDERGRASS: I would -- If you have a question, if you could keep it short for once, thank you.
MR. TOMPKINS: Commander, on the survey of the residents the in interviews that you've taken place, will you include, for example, so that we get a

comprehensive picture in terms of the different jobs, locations, so that when we get the information and start piecing together, if we only have -- for example, interview people in Parcel A or in Parcel B, we wouldn't have an idea of what's taken place in Parcel E, so we can get a comprehensive overview in terms of where people worked at so that as we look and analyze the data and information that was received, what was the totality.

Also, similar to Mr. Campbell's previous -- other commander had made a presentation to us and for Risk Assessment Committee, in your assessments as you go through it, could you see as exposures things were in operation, what was the risk factor to the community and exposure levels when they -- we -- while looking at the community? 'Cause the Risk Assessment can work on that.

We need to get the information before so as we work through it when these things were in operation, because we are affected, even though it's shut down. As we look at generations of cancer and the rest of it, which we have high rates.

CDR. FRAGOSO: That's a very good question, sir. The only thing I --

MR. TOMPKINS: If you can help us in terms of --

CDR. FRAGOSO: Yeah, oh, definitely. That's what you're asking?

MR. TOMPKINS: Right. As you're going through --

CDR. FRAGOSO: Oh, yeah.

MR. TOMPKINS: -- and analyzing it, if you can tell Maurice, yeah, it escaped; and the question is how and what your thought's on it.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Oh, yeah, definitely, definitely.

MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FORMAN: The key here is couple things. If you're interested in this topic -- and there should be quite a bit of interest in this topic -- couple things to remember:

First of all, as he and Mr. Lowman and Mrs. Lowman dig through this and as the picture comes together that you're speaking of, there's going to be fact sheets that we put out. We will continue to update you at the RAB. Remember with the landfill gas where we continued every month to update for a while? We'll continue with this as we progress. You can expect to see that at each RAB.

But still a key to this is going to be the Radiological Subcommittee meetings with Dr. Sumchai, and

that's where she's -- most likely every subcommittee meeting now is going to invite us to come.

And we'll -- we will deal with the topics at hand as they are discovered; and as we -- we find information, we'll deal with them at subcommittee meeting. That seems to be the most productive way to get into real detailed information.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Can I -- can I just add one thing to that, Mr. Forman?

MR. FORMAN: Sure.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I think because this is a public meeting -- and I'm not saying that the Radiological Committee may not put this together and bring this forward as a -- as a recommendation, but I think Miss Asher's point is well-taken, that the procedures need to be distributed in terms of what exactly the steps are --

MR. TOMPKINS: What's the protocol.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- so that they're any help.

MR. FORMAN: Sure, sure, and --

MS. PENDERGRASS: If that could be --

MR. FORMAN: Sure. At each RAB meeting, we'll have -- we'll have a presentation. Either Commander here or Laurie will be out at each RAB meeting to give a presentation and answer questions each month.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All rightie, then. Thank you so much. That was an excellent presentation.

CDR. FRAGOSO: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: All rightie, then. We are just a little bit ahead of schedule, so let's do subcommittee reports.

Let's kick-start with Economic Development and, again, a summation of what happened in your -- a summary of what happened. But there should be written minutes of your committees; and then if there's any recommendations that needed action, we would need to bring them forward. Mr. Mason.

MR. MASON: I'm glad everybody could make it. Thank you.

I'm stepping down from chair, and I'm going to become the assistant chair. Maurice Campbell is the chair of the Economic Committee, and I want to thank all those who have come.

But I want to let you know that I'm still going to be the monitor on the Shipyard, and I'm going to make sure that the contractors are doing some of the things that they need to be doing and assessing those. Then I'll be bringing all my information to Maurice, because he's the chair now.

So we're getting into some economic times where the community needs to really be involved in the money situation with the Navy and some of the contractors. So we've become a team.

So Maurice is chair. I'm assistant chair, and I'm going to still be -- be liaison out there. But Maurice did the facilitating at the last meeting, so I'm just going to pass the mic over to him.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Mr. Mason. And you served well with that --

MR. MASON: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- as committee chair.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Basically, what we concentrated on is getting answers from the Navy as exactly how much money -- work money has been contracted to the local 94124 communities since the shutdown of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.

There are some questions, minutes, that are up there. There's enough for everybody to have one.

And we have James Fields here, and -- and he is from --

Well, James, you can introduce yourself briefly.

He will be working with our contractors

locally. James is with the HRC from San Francisco, the Human Rights Commission.

And one of the things that we are -- we are going to concentrate on, there's been so much money that has been spent in remediation at the Shipyard, and the local community really didn't have a hand in that.

So what we're hoping to have happen is basically have the D- -- the people that know DBE best with the City also work with our subcommittee, also work with -- I'm sorry -- our community and also work for the Navy in making sure on the money that's coming in that we have a fair share.

That's our community report. Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Campbell. Let's see. Now, your next meeting is March 12th at 3 o'clock?

Mr. Campbell? Your next meeting is March 12th at 3 o'clock?

MR. CAMPBELL: At -- at 3 o'clock and --

MS. PENDERGRASS: And where is that at again?

MR. CAMPBELL: It's BDI, 1790 Yosemite. We're on the second floor.

MR. MASON: I want to say this now. We -- we scheduled the same type of meeting last month, February 12th. And we also had the -- the Technical

Committee at the same -- on the same date, Keith. So you -- you passed by the Economic meeting and went to the Tech. We are at 3 o'clock. The -- the Tech is usually at 6:00.

So if you're in the city, you could probably make both of them; and I think you ought to make -- probably make both of them.

MR. CAMPBELL: Excuse me. That has been answered already.

MS. PENDERGRASS: We have taken care of that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Keith and Dave said they would be attending.

MR. MASON: I just didn't want that to occur again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure. Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Let's move on to Membership & Bylaws. Miss Rines, are you doing that today?

MS. RINES: Okay.

Okay. We had our Membership & Bylaws meeting, and we had one application from Lea Loizos from Arc Ecology. We reviewed the application, and we made a motion. We accepted it in the Bylaws Committee, and we are presenting it to the RAB for acceptance.

MS. PENDERGRASS: And your motion . . . ?

MS. RINES: Our motion is to accept Lea as the Arc Ecology rep on the RAB board --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is she here tonight?

MS. RINES: -- under "Envi- --" I'm sorry. Under "Environmental Organization." That's the category that she is.

MS. PETERSON: I have a question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Just a moment --

MS. PETERSON: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- 'cause we have a motion on the floor, so I have to call for discussion at this point. Yes, ma'am.

MS. PETERSON: Okay. A lot of -- Some of the RAB members have been complaining because they -- okay.

Some of the RAB members have been complaining because they are not seeing the applications. So I was discussing with Mr. Tisdell that if we could have the applications presented to the RAB as a whole and wi- -- so that they can at least have something in front of them to see the qualifications, et cetera, and then they go to the -- in addition to going to the committee.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I think -- I think that if I remember correctly, about four meetings ago, Ms. Rines and Mr. Tisdell outlined your plan for accepting of new people, which meant that you needed to come to the

subcommittee if you wanted to kind of have some in-depth discussion about that, and then you would make forth a recommendation.

So -- unless you all amended that process --

MS. PETERSON: No, I'm not -- That -- It's not a process. I'm just saying before you had a copy of every -- okay. Before you got a copy of everybody's application.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Before you didn't have this process of dealing with it.

MS. PETERSON: Yes, you did. Even with the subcommittees, you had a copy of everybody's application. So --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. PETERSON: -- it's just a suggestion.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. And that suggestion kind of fell during this discussion period.

Did I see a hand over here? First? Okay. Yes, ma'am.

MS. SUMCHAI: I -- I wanted to make a few comments with regard to the process of -- of RAB membership in -- in respect to the -- the mission of the RAB and to all the people who will come together on a monthly basis and more frequently than that to advance the cleanup and remediation of the -- the Shipyard.

I have always respected this as a democratically elected body, and I have been concerned by a number of incidents that have occurred in recent months in which individuals have been identified as being members of the RAB prior to their being voted onto the RAB. And by virtue of whatever process or miscommunication is going on, I do think that it's something that we need to be more cognizant about.

Many of you received an e-mail communication that I intentionally spread as broadly as I could. I personally was not made aware of Christine Shirley's resignation from the RAB. I knew nothing about it until I came here for the January meeting, and there was no announcement whatsoever that I had received.

And Miss Loizos, of course, came to the Radiological Subcommittee and announced herself to be a member of the RAB; and Mr. Forman corrected her, that she hadn't been voted on properly. But apparently, she was confused about her own membership here. She hadn't taken out an application yet.

I -- After, you know, this had happened, I received, I guess, a week ago an e-mail message from Kevyn Lutton that had been directed to Barbara Bushnell challenging Barbara's interim leadership of the TRC committee.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Dr. Sumchai? Can you --

MS. SUMCHAI: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- get to the --?

MS. SUMCHAI: Well, let me just -- let me just make the point that you have a response here from Arc Ecology to some concerns that I generated in an e-mail message about some conflict-of-interest issues. I would like two things to come out of this.

One, my understanding is that there are some RAB guidelines that identify conflicts of interest that occur when RAB members enter into contractual agreements with Navy contractors or with the Navy or with other parties in the cleanup process. I would like to see those guidelines.

And secondly, I would like to say that Mr. Bloom's rebuttal here -- I'm sorry that he didn't have the courage to attend this meeting, but he has substantiated everything that I outlined in my concerns about the fatness of this organization, how this organization has grown and benefited politically and financially --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Do- --

MS. SUMCHAI: -- from its relationships.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Dr. Sumchai, I'm -- please forgive me because I don't want to be rude, but I am

not -- I -- there's a little bit that's kind of like way over here, and so maybe everybody's not on the -- on the same page of it.

But let me break down what I heard you say to make sure that we are all -- because we are in the discussion phase of a motion to accept a person as a RAB member.

Now, the bylaws clearly state that the subcommittee chair must be a RAB member.

MS. SUMCHAI: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: You're quite right in that.

And thank you, Mr. Forman, for pointing that out that she was not a RAB member at the time. She did inquire about that at the last meeting.

However, a subcommittee -- any subcommittee attendees and members do not have to be RAB members. All subcommittee members do not have to be RAB members. So, you know, there can be a mixture of people who are RAB and not RAB on subcommittees.

But to bring that to the point, at this point, we are just talking about bringing on this candidate as a RAB member. We are not dealing with a committee sub -- or the subcommittee chair position at this point. The point on the table here is the acceptance of this person as a RAB member.

So unless there's some more discussion, I think we just need to hear a moment or two from our new candidate. Maybe she could just say something.

So Mr. --

MS. PIERCE: No, I just was going to call for question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Before we call the question, is there any other discussion that has not been heard before we hear Lea's statement real quick?

MR. MANUEL: I got my hand up.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry.

MR. MANUEL: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

MR. MANUEL: I can bark pretty loud, so . . .

ATTENDEE: That's okay.

MR. MANUEL: Anyway, here -- here's the situation here: We have two members that -- As someone mentioned, it's a democratic process here. We have two members with concerns. Frankly, I don't believe any question is irrelevant; and I think the concerns, I think, should be addressed some sort of way.

And -- and I -- and what I heard the good doctor's point being is that there's a process that's being sidestepped by -- by persons, or at least that was her concern. And I think that we need to be sensitive

about all of our members and the community at large's concerns when they are raised.

I don't think anybody --

MS. PENDERGRASS: And --

MR. MANUEL: -- should be kind of -- you know, kind of shut up, you know, when they have gone through the process to be a member or whether or not they're the public or whoever.

I think -- I think everybody's questions are relevant, and I don't -- you know, I don't think we should --

MS. PENDERGRASS: A- -- Again --

MR. MANUEL: -- disregard anybody's --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Again --

MR. MANUEL: -- anybody's concerns.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Again, we are not disregarding Dr. Sumchai's comments. She made a number of comments.

The ones that were relevant for discussion at this motion is what I'm concerned with at this moment. So we can certainly address those after we address this issue. We are just trying to make sure that we are dealing -- everybody's on the same page.

Right now we're talking about the acceptance of a new RAB member that's been recommended from the

Membership Subcommittee --

MR. MANUEL: Keith has --

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- and --

MR. MANUEL: -- his hand up over there.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- and before I asked if there was more discussion, we were going to hear just a statement from the candidate.

MS. PETERSON: Keith has his hand up.

MR. MANUEL: Keith has his hand up over there.

MS. ATTENDEE: Change -- changed his mind.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Go ahead. Introduce yourself.

MS. LOIZOS: Hi. I am Lea Loizos. I've put in an application for the RAB. I've been working with Arc Ecology for about 15 months now, 14 or 15 months. My background is in environmental and plant biology.

Like I said, I've been working with Arc Ecology for 14 months, before -- working on the Community Window on the Shipyard project, which I started working on in about October. I've been sitting on the Mare Island and Alameda RABs and working with some of the technical focus groups there as well.

So I have a good idea of how this process works, and I've been learning a lot more about the BRAC process as I go -- as I run along.

And I guess that's pretty much all you need to hear.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

Did you have a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: No. I think we need to call for the question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. All right. That -- I will call the question is to accept Lea --

MS. LOIZOS: Loizos.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Lea Loizos as a member of the RAB. All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?

Okay. We have to have a count, then. All those opposed, raise your hands so I can count them.

(Simultaneous colloquy.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: So there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Seven noes.

And let's see how many ayes did we have again? One, two, three, four, five six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven. Okay.

Any abstentions on that?

MS. SUMCHAI: I'm going to abstain. I'd like to say that I'm going to continue to abstain until the Bylaws & Membership Committee makes a sincere effort at

bringing on a Chinese-American member to this RAB. This community has at least 20, 25 percent Chinese-American, and I'm just going to stop voting until we get somebody on there.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you for that.

Okay. At this point --

MS. ATTENDEE: I -- I need to address that.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Wait. Before we do this, what we're going to do now is that we've had a passing of this motion, which means we now have a new RAB member, and she is welcome to come to this table.

(Applause.)

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. At this point, Ms. Rines, you're still making your subcommittee report; and if you have any other recommendations you'd like to offer --

MS. RINES: Oh.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- please make them as a form of a motion or if you have another one.

MR. TISDELL: Okay. For those who are abstaining because -- because there's not a Oriental Asian -- Asian member on board, you need to be at the next RAB meeting, because we do have applications.

And we meet from 6:00 to 8:00 -- I get the

keys to the library on Tuesday when it closes at 6:00; and if you come in, you come in through the side door, and it will be right there. And our next meeting is March 11th from 6:00 to 8:00.

MS. RINES: Our meetings are very quick.

MR. TISDELL: Huh?

MS. RINES: Our meetings are very quick.

MR. TISDELL: Yes, our meetings are very quick, and we usually be out of there before 7:00. And -- and we meet every second Tuesday of every month.

MR. MASON: Not this time.

MR. MANUEL: Nobody's ever seen a Asian in here before? Here's a Asian [indicating]. What do you think she is?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Ma- --

MR. MANUEL: Chopped liver?

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Okay.

MR. ATTENDEE: Hey, come on.

MS. PENDERGRASS: One thing we do need to address, though, I think that the point is taken that if we do have resumes for candidates, that -- do you all keep a binder or something that you might bring for the other RAB members to look through and --?

MR. TISDELL: What hap- -- what happened was: We get the application and we fax them to Ron, and then

our -- get them to Ron, and he does them, and he -- and then he'd send them back to us.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay, but --

MR. TISDELL: So we -- you know, we both got a copy of the applications that he gets.

MS. PENDERGRASS: The que- -- the question is, though, if someone on the RAB would like to see the credentials or -- or what's bringing a person to the RAB, if you -- you have that information, if you could bring it to the RAB meeting, then someone can look at it on the break. I think that's an excellent way to handle that.

Are you finished, Miss Rines?

MS. RINES: Yes.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Is there any other questions that pertain to membership and bylaws?

MR. PALEGA: I think Dr. Sumchai raised a question, and it seems like it's getting pushed under the rug with regards to the conflict of interest.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MR. PALEGA: I mean, you know, that is something that's real real, and we have to address that. And I know that Jesse's -- you know, is saying this may not be the right body; but somebody needs to address it, because that is our community. Okay? So --

MS. PENDERGRASS: I -- I think that's totally --

MR. PALEGA: You know, I mean, not just out front people benefiting from it, and they are on here, and they're in any way any form making any of those directions and/or their friends are making in their part of that, then cough --

MS. PENDERGRASS: I --

MR. PALEGA -- up to it and get established.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I've heard that twice now. I --

MR. PALEGA: I mean, you know.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Pierce, just one moment.

MR. PALEGA: Because I think it's -- I think Dr. Sumchai's point is well-tooken [sic], and we want to be effective. We don't want to become the money bag --

MR. MANUEL: Exactly.

MR. PALEGA: -- for airing the money to friends and ourselves --

MR. MANUEL: I agree.

MR. PALEGA: -- you know, real simple for me.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We have Miss Pierce, and then -- I'm sorry.

MS. PIERCE: Over two years ago, community members at the RAB raised the issue of conflict of

interest.

And we were informed at that time that the way RABs were set up, it is expected and intended that contractors would be members of the RAB, because we raised that very issue.

So we need to hear back from the Navy on this again, I guess, because we have new RAB members.

But I just want to stress that we should not be asking for greater controls or barriers for community members' grass roots organizations than the Navy puts on itself because their contractors sit as members of this RAB.

MR. MANUEL: The don't vote.

MS. PETERSON: They don't vote.

MR. MANUEL: They don't vote. They don't decide anything.

MS. LUTTON: Well, what I want to say is: There has been rumors going around about Arc Ecology. And if there's issues with Arc Ecology, then I -- and people want to investigate them or -- or bring up issues with their financial dealings, that's something that I think is outside of the purview of the RAB.

What I know about Arc Ecology after working for a year with the meetings, with the techs meetings and the risk assessment, they have been extremely helpful to

the community in terms of giving us information and fleshing out --

MR. MANUEL: Making money.

MS. LUTTON: -- ways of tackling scientific problems that no layperson would have on their own.

And if people manage to get rid of Arc Ecology for whatever reason, it would be a serious loss to the community, and I don't think it should happen until they are replaced by another group with the same kind of expertise, training, and salary to work for the community.

As far as the other issues about stealing money or whatever you think, I think that's outside of the purview of this RAB.

MS. PENDERGRASS: First of all, I think that, you know, we're having this discussion which is taking time from the other subcommittee --

MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- reports, which is something we need to do. At this point, I'm going to stop this conversation.

What we -- what we need to do, what we need to do on this is set some time on the agenda to talk about it. And quite frankly, your bylaws are quite clear on this matter. But we need time to talk about it so that

everybody's clear about it. This will be an action item on the next agenda to talk about it, or at least that's what we need to put in on the next agenda.

At this point, we need to continue -- or we'll all be here till late at night -- with the next subcommittee report, radiological issues. And who's bringing that report?

MS. SUMCHAI: I will keep it bee -- brief.

You guys have received by e-mail and hard copy the minutes of the January meeting, and they closely parallel the minutes as well as the PowerPoint presentation that Laurie Lowman presented.

I do want to make one point only, and that is that we have failed to deal with the radiological operations at Parcel E, including the landfill. And without question, some of the most serious potentials for -- for radiation has existed on that parcel.

And from what is known in the draft HRA, which as of next month will be a year old, the Parcel E landfill was the site of radioactive sources, including radium in soil, radon gas, and radium-containing devices. And then there were a number of buildings that were used to -- as storehouses for radiation sources as well as laboratories for NRDL.

So please let's not, you know, forget that

Parcel E is -- is a focus that we have to always keep at the top of our radar screen.

And in keeping with that, at our next Radiological Subcommittee meeting, we definitely need to have an update on Parcel E radiological operations; and we also need to continue to monitor the status of the HRA and the search for oral history of former employees.

Kevyn Lutton, I have invited her to make a presentation about her proposal for a community radiation school. We need to follow up on the status of Building 366 and take us very, very seriously if there's a potential for radiation exposure, that perhaps people need to be evacuated from that building as a work or studio site.

And then I have also been contacted by a reporter at the CHRONICLE, Jane Kay, who was very interested in following up on Building 815; and we probably need to revisit some of the issues pertaining to that building and the Department of Public Health's letters to the property owner as of last year and the status of that DPH investigation.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Do you have any recommendations in your report in terms of the --? The only thing I heard was that you were inviting some folks to speak at the subcommittee meetings, and that's about

it.

MS. SUMCHAI: Well, the recommendations are that people come to the meeting --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

MS. SUMCHAI: -- on the 26th. Kevyn and I talked about --

(Unintelligible interruption.)

MS. SUMCHAI: Excuse me. -- March 26th to put together something for the radiation school in proposal form and then other information that Daryl of New World Technology and Department of Public Health can provide.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Thank you very much.

Risk review. Who's doing that?

MS. PIERCE: I chaired the Risk Review Subcommittee. We did meet on February 13th, and the discussion was around the dissatisfaction with the report from ATSDR.

So we determined that for our March meeting, we would invite ATSDR back. I have conferred with Na- -- the Navy to identify a date. We have a tentative date.

I now have a confirmed date when the Navy will be able to be present, and we'll get ATSDR to be present also. That date is March 11th at 5:30. The location is to be announced. We don't have a confirmed spot, since we had to change the date.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Can you make sure, though, that you get where it is and send that to Ron so that he can get an e-mail out to everybody so that --

MS. PIERCE: I --

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- everybody knows where it is?

MS. PIERCE: I will. And the committee came up with a list of questions, specific questions, for ATSDR. I will put that into the memo also --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.

MS. PIERCE: -- so all of that will be available.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.

MS. PIERCE: And then if I could ask the indulgence . . . I sit on another committee that has a regular meeting from 4:00 to 6:00, so I'm always late. I missed the announcements. This is related to risk review. If I can just make a very quick announcement. The next HEAP meeting is on March 13th.

MS. PENDERGRASS: What kind of meeting?

MS. PIERCE: HEAP, H-E-A-P. The Health and Environmental Assessment Task Force meeting is on Thursday, March 13, from 5:30 to 7:00 at Southeast Health Center.

The agenda item for that meeting is war and its

effect on funding the cleanup of the Shipyard and how we will identify Homeland Security funding to replace any funding that is lost if we go to war.

I urge all of you to attend that meeting. It's a strategy meeting. Members of the Department of Public Health will be involved.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you.

The Technical Review Committee, I understand, is Miss Bushnell?

MS. BUSHNELL: Yes.

I know I'll need this [indicating microphone]. I'll try to be brief also.

We met on the 19th at the library, discussed several items about I wanted to be certain if there was this notion that Parcel A was -- was waiting for the HRA to be complete before potential hand-over.

There are also some issues of methane where the Parcel E and A conjoin, and that's also under consideration under Parcel A.

We discussed -- A lot of the discussion ended up about -- about the water areas, about "C" -- "B," "C," "D," and "E" all -- all have water access and what kind of studies are being done on that. And that's all being studied along with Parcel F along with all this. We don't have a lot of data and numbers.

But Keith actually pointed out that the focus for this subcommittee would be to read the groundwater reports that are coming out, and they are still coming.

But -- and there was also a memo that I had uncovered that mentioned certain areas on Parcel B where there was PCBs and petroleum hydrocarbon compounds that were detected, and they are studying that; and that's right on the water, and there's a map to indicate where that is.

Again, that's it to be reported.

The next Tech Subcommittee meeting is March 12th at 6 o'clock at the Anna Waden Library, and I would like to announce that I would like to continue as chair of the Technical Subcommittee.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Now, at this point, I know there's some discussion around that. We're out of time on this, and -- and this is what I suggest that we need to do. This -- this is a discussion about who wants to be a chair of the subcommittee --

MR. CAMPBELL: That wasn't my question.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- and -- No, but I'm saying, there may be some discussion about that, and I think that that should happen at the subcommittee meeting when you all come together and make some kind of

recommendation to the RAB.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So I think that we need to set kind of a precedent of how we need to handle filling vacancies in terms of the subcommittees.

So we will expect at the next -- for the next meeting that you will make a report, Miss Bushnell, on, you know, what you all decided and make a recommendation so we can either approve or -- can approve the subcommittee chair.

Does that make sense to everybody?

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

MR. CAMPBELL: This concerns the whole RAB in regards to the Tech Subcommittee.

There was a date given out by Dave DeMars which concerns the adjacency issue with Parcel A and methane. And I wondered if Dave -- Dave would just give us the date on the methane.

You said something about June possibly.

MR. DeMARS: Are you referring to when the report is due to come out?

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

MR. DeMARS: The close-out report for the --?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. DeMARS: I believe it's sometime in June that we are expecting the close-out report for the methane gas removal action to come out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right. And that does affect transfer. So you can't have a transfer until after that, because that feeds into the cost.

MR. DeMARS: Correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Before we adjourn, is there any burning issue that we did not cover a question from any of our audience that perhaps that we didn't answer?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOIZOS: Well, if I could maybe briefly address this issue about conflict of interest. And I'm not going to get into it right now, but I just wanted to say that that's the point of that letter that I passed out. If you didn't get a copy of it, please let me know, because I'm not trying to hide anything from anybody and --

MS. PENDERGRASS: We need to have that discussion. Thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. MANUEL: Real brief. I like to offer up a

motion that we address some of the questions that were raised earlier by many of the members that was abruptly terminated. Maybe it was improper to be discussed at that time, but there should be a time set aside so that everyone is on the same page and we as a group can move on. I think that at some future meeting, we should discuss this and clear the air on this.

MS. PENDERGRASS: I'm sorry. I thought -- I thought we just had put that on the agenda for the next --

MR. MANUEL: I didn't know that we did.

MS. PETERSON: I --

MS. PENDERGRASS: Is that not correct?

MS. PETERSON: Well --

MS. PENDERGRASS: That's the understanding.

MS. PETERSON: -- I think we should add conflict of interest, period --

MS. PENDERGRASS: We --

MS. PETERSON: -- in addition to Arc Ecology.

MR. MANUEL: I didn't know that we did. So that's fine if that's the indication.

MS. PENDERGRASS: No. It was conflict of interest is what we were talking about.

MR. MANUEL: Oh, okay. Okay. I missed it.

MR. MASON: I have a comment. I have a

comment.

I know Arc Ecology and I'm -- I'm not --

MS. PENDERGRASS: But we are not discussing that.

MR. MASON: But the point is this. The point I'm trying to make is this: Arc Ecology has been instrumental in the community for quite some time for some things. Allow Arc Ecology to defend itself. You know, if you want to discuss conflict of interest, bring Arc Ecology down to the RAB and let them defend themselves. That's all I'm saying.

MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, I think they're willing to frame that in terms of a discussion so everybody would be prepared to talk about that at the next meeting --

MR. MANUEL: Okay.

MS. PENDERGRASS: -- since there's consensus that we want to add that to the agenda.

At this point, this meeting is adjourned.

(Off record at 8:08 p.m., 2/27/03.)

---oOo---

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting was reported by me stenographically to the best of my ability at the time and place aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand this _____ day of _____, ____.

_____

CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, C.S.R. NO. 4569